

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	LICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,243	02/26/2002	Naoya Ichikawa	2809-0124P	3483	
2292	7590 01/29/2004		EXAMINER		
	EWART KOLASCH &	MULCAHY, PETER D			
PO BOX 74 FALLS CH	7 URCH, VA 22040-0747	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1713		
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					$\mathcal{O}($			
<del></del>		App	olication No.	Applicant(s)				
			082,243	ICHIKAWA ET	AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Exa	min r	Art Unit				
			er D. Mulcahy	1713				
Period fo	Th MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication appears	onth covrsh t	with th correspond nce	address			
THE   - External effect - If the   - If NO   - Failur   - Any (	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUI msions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this conperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty period for reply is specified above, the maximum re to reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three months of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nmunication. (30) days, a reply within statutory period will applicy will, by statute, cause	n no event, however, may the statutory minimum of t y and will expire SIX (6) M the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered tin ONTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nely. communication.			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on <u>03 Novem</u>	<u>ber 2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action	n is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers			* •				
9)	The specification is objected to by t	he Examiner.	. ·					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	e: a)⊡ accepted	or b)□ objected t	to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any obj		- ,	• •				
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	•	•	Ŧ · / ·	, ,			
•	The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examin	er. Note the attacr	ied Office Action of form i	710-152.			
-	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			. 0.440/-> /-> /0				
* \$ 13)	Acknowledgment is made of a clai  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priorit  2. Certified copies of the priorit  3. Copies of the certified copie application from the Internat See the attached detailed Office act acknowledgment is made of a claim ince a specific reference was included.  7 CFR 1.78.  1 The translation of the foreign is acknowledgment is made of a claim	y documents hav y documents hav s of the priority do ional Bureau (PC ion for a list of the for domestic priority led in the first sen anguage provision for domestic priority	e been received. e been received in ocuments have been T Rule 17.2(a)). e certified copies no ority under 35 U.S. otence of the specienal application has ority under 35 U.S.	n Application No en received in this Nation ot received. C. § 119(e) (to a provision fication or in an Application been received. C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since	nal application) on Data Sheet. ce a specific			
re	eference was included in the first se	ntence of the spe	ecification or in an a	Application Data Sheet. 3	/ CFR 1./8.			
Attachmen	• •							
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)			w Summary (PTO-413) Paper N of Informal Patent Application (P				

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

-2-

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,253.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed invention is directed to species of the generically claimed surfactants. These surfactants are shown and claimed within this patent and as such, the instantly claimed species are rendered prima facie obvious.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the

Serial No. 10/082,243

Art Unit 1713

time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al., either U.S. 6,239,253 or 5,910,567 or 5,610,212 each taken alone and in the alternative.

The '253 patent shows the instantly claimed protease and combination of surfactants at columns 7 and 8.

The '567 patent shows the treatment of natural rubber latexes with the instantly claimed protease and the combination of surfactants at column 4 lines 5+.

The '212 patent shows compositions wherein the natural rubber latex is treated with the protease and combination surfactants at column 3 lines 1+. In view of this disclosure, applicants' claims are seen to be <a href="mailto:prima\_facie">prima\_facie</a> obvious.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected,

Serial No. 10/082,243

Art Unit 1713

to make and/or use the invention. The invention as described in claim 1 is seen to be not enabled by the instant specification. The claim language of claim 1 is exclusively descriptive of the properties possessed by the natural rubber latex rather than any process step for forming such latex or compositional ingredients utilized in forming such latex. As such, this claim is seen to be a single means claim which covers every conceivable means for achieving the stated property. This is to say that the patentability of the instant claim is exclusively dependent upon the property and the claim is not commensurate in scope with the enabling disclosure of the specification wherein specific latexes are described in terms of compositional ingredients and the processes for forming such latexes. See In re Hyatt 218 USPQ 195.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no undue or serious burden is placed upon the patent examiner to examine the claims of both groups. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are seen to be distinct for the reasons as advanced in Paper No. 6. Applicants' opinion regarding the undue burden is not necessarily relevant given the different classifications of the invention as well as the distinctness of the inventions. Furthermore, search and examination of one

Art Unit 1713

invention would not necessarily entail the search and examination of the other invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter D. Mulcahy, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1107. The examiner can normally be reached during regular business hours.

The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0994.

P. Mulcahy:cdc January 21, 2004

> PETER D. MULCAHY PRIMARY EXAMINER